W.	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/048,020	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	Charles G Freay	3746	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Charles G Freay</u> .	(3)		
(2) Matt Shanley.	(4)		
Date of Interview:	Time:		
Type of Interview:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: the rejection under the background art Figures of the application and possible rejections in view of hemispherical valves.			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
July my	/Anglicant's Danson statics Of	anoturo if annon-into	
(Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – ir appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant stated that the background art figures in his specification were not prior art under 102 and that the background art type of valves shown were from in house development, the examiner stated that the rejections set forth in paper number 10 were overcome. After further considering the prior art and updating the search the examiner noted that the claims should be amended to claim that the spring contacted the rear hemispherically shaped surface of the valve in order to overcome other hemispherical valves.